



Fiscal Note On: HB 68

**HB 68** HLS 02-

277

Bill Text Version: ENROLLED

Opp Chamb Action: Sub Bill For:

Proposed Amd:

**Date:** June 9, 2002 7:26 PM

TAX/AD VALOREM-EXEMPTION

Author: THOMPSON

Analyst: Greg Albrecht

**Dept/Agy:** Economic Development / Local Governments

Subject: Property Tax - Exemption for Retirement Communities

Page 1 of 1

(Constitutional Amendment) Authorizes the State Board of Commerce and Inc

Commerce and Industry to contract with developers of retirement

communities for exemptions from ad valorem taxation

Authorizes the C&I Board, with the approval of the governor and the affected local tax authorities, to enter into local property tax exemption contracts with developers of retirement communities on terms provided by law. To be submitted at the statewied election on November 5, 2002.

EN DECREASE LF RV See Note

The statutory enabling legislation is contained in HB 84 that is contingent upon the adoption of this constitutional amendment. The discussion in this fiscal note is the discussion contained in the fiscal note for HB 84. The tax exemptions are granted so long as 80% of the property is sold to retirees within the exemption period. A qualified retiree is a person over the age of fifty-five. A qualified retirement community is a new development or renovated existing developments for qualified retirees.

EXPENDITURES	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	5 YEAR TOTAL
State General Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Stat. Deds./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>
Annual Total	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	\$0	\$ 0
REVENUES	2002.02	2002.04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	5 YEAR TOTAL
KEVENUES	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	2004-03	<u> 2003-00</u>	<u> 2000-07</u>	S TEAR TOTAL
State General Fd.	<b>2002-03</b> \$0			\$0	\$0	
State General Fd.		\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0			\$ 1 EAR 101AL \$ 0 \$ 0
State General Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State General Fd. Agy. Self-Gen. Stat. Deds./Other	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$ 0 \$ 0
State General Fd. Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$ 0 \$ 0 \$ 0

## EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION:

The Department of Economic Development would likely charge application fees to support the administrative costs associated with this new program. Should the number of applications reach a significant level, the department would also need additional personnel. It is speculative as to how many applications for this exemption would be received.

## **REVENUE EXPLANATION:**

To the extent the authority created in this bill is exercised, <u>local revenues are likely to be reduced substantially</u> below what they might otherwise be.

The enabling legislation does allow tax exemptions for a targeted kind of retirement development and requires a relatively high percentage (80%) of the units of such a development be utilized by retirees; and, this works to keep the revenue losses from these developments smaller than they might be otherwise. However, population data indicates that the absolute number of retirement age citizens has been growing steadily since 1990, as has the share of that age group in the state population. Thus, it is likely that retirement communities such as the ones targeted by this bill are currently being constructed in the state and will be constructed regardless of the tax exemption allowed by this bill. It seems unlikely that revenue losses from tax exemptions granted to baseline retirement community construction will be materially offset by new incremental activity which might be stimulated by the tax exemption.

Illustrative of the potential local revenue loss possible under this bill is a project that the Department of Economic Development indicates it is aware of. Were this one project to be exempt from property tax, local tax revenue might be reduced by some \$632,000 per year.

Senate <u>Dual Referral Rules</u>

☐ 13.5.1 >= \$500,000 Annual Fiscal Cost

House ☐ 6.8(F)

☐ 6.8(F) >= \$500,000 Annual Fiscal Cost

H. Gordon Monk
STAFF DIRECTOR

H. Hordon Mark

■ 13.5.2 >= \$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change

☐ 6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease per year